

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-10 constitute the pending claims in the present application. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. Issues raised by the Examiner will be addressed below in the order they appear in the prior Office Action.

Rejection Based on 35 U.S.C. §112, First Paragraph. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it is maintained over the claims as amended.

The Office Action suggests that the recitations of heteroaryl rings in the claims render the claims so broad as to exceed the scope enabled by the specification. Applicants disagree with this assessment, because many of the compounds disclosed in the specification have heteroaryl rings at these positions, showing that a wide range of heteroaryl rings are in fact enabled by the specification. However, solely to expedite prosecution of the remaining claims, Applicants have removed references to heteroaryl rings generically, and replaced certain instances with specific examples, including 2-quinolylmethyl.

Additionally, Applicants request that the Examiner withdraw the utility rejection of claims 1-10 in light of the fact that claim 1 is now directed to a method of treating inflammatory disease mediated by monocyte chemoattractant protein-1 and/or RANTES induced chemotaxis. Applicants that the present claims now recite a specific and well understood utility.

Finally, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully refer to pages 17 and 18 in the specification where examples of reaction conditions for the conversion of a group  $R^{3'}$  to a group  $R^3$  are provided. Furthermore, claim 10 has been amended, as described below, to more particularly point out the invention being claimed. Applicants submit that the claim as amended is fully supported by the specification as filed. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

For the reasons set forth above, Applicants submit that the claims as currently amended fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Based on 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph. Claims 7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection to the extent it is maintained over the claims as amended.

Applicants submit that the rejection of claim 7 is moot, since this claim has been cancelled. With respect to claim 10, Applicants have amended this claim to remove the terms “if desired or necessary” in claim 10, line 10, and “precursor” in claim 10, lines 6 and 11. Applicants submit that the amended claim is clear and definite. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.


### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. The Examiner may address any questions raised by this submission to the undersigned at 617-951-7000. Should an extension of time be required, Applicants hereby petition for same and request that the extension fee and any other fee required for timely consideration of this submission be charged to **Deposit Account No. 18-1945**.

Date: November 12, 2003

**Customer No: 28120**  
Docketing Specialist  
Ropes & Gray LLP  
One International Place  
Boston, MA 02110  
Phone: 617-951-7000  
Fax: 617-951-7050

Respectfully Submitted,



---

David P. Halstead  
Reg. No. 44,735